



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a live article on "In What Does the Originality of Judaism Consist?" Part II, the encyclopedic department, the most useful and permanent in the volume, was compiled by Dr. Deutsch. It cites for each day of the calendar year the memorable dates in Jewish history. This with its index covers 153 pages. Part III is Hebrew Union College department. Here we find the important events of the college recited; together with excellent portraits of the faculty, and graduates of 1904.

GEORGE S. GOODSPED.

IRA M. PRICE.

HERBERT L. WILLETT.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS ON EARLY CHRISTIAN AND
TALMUDIC LITERATURE

Volume X of the great Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries contains the fourth volume of the works of Origen.¹ Lic. Dr. Erwin Preuschen, the well-known collaborator of Harnack in his monumental *History of Early Christian Literature*, was charged by the commission with the editing of Origen's commentary on John.² The editor has discharged his duties most acceptably and admirably. His work shows the same excellences, critical acumen, and philological discrimination³ so noticeable in the volumes edited by P. Koetschau and Erich Klostermann. Like its predecessors, the volume consists of the Introduction (pp. ix-cviii), the text (pp. 3-574), and indexes (pp. 575-667); augmented by a page and a half of "Additions and Corrections." To the reviewer as well as to the general reader the introduction is, of course, the great attraction. Here the editor discusses in two long chapters the manuscripts and the history of the printed text, and the origin of the commentary, the exegesis and text of the church father, and Heracleon's notes on the gospel of John.

Of the extant eight manuscripts six (fifteenth to seventeenth century) are mere copies of the two earlier ones, viz., the Monacensis (= M.) graecus 191 (thirteenth century) and the Venetus (graecus 43 = V.) (of the year

¹ Reviews of Vols. I, II, and III of Origen's works are printed in this *Journal*, Vol. IV, pp. 839-44 (October, 1900), and Vol. VII, pp. 336-38 (July, 1903).

² *Origenes' Johanneskommentar*. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften von Erwin Preuschen. [= "Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," Vol. X.] Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903. cviii+668 pages. M. 24.50; bound, M. 27.

³ In which Paul Wendland has been of the greatest help to the editor, almost four hundred out of the one thousand or more emendations being credited to him alone.

1374). A. E. Brooke was the first scholar to declare V. a copy—or rather a revised edition—of the Monacensis.⁴ In Harnack's *Litteratur-Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 391, Preuschen assumed, in addition, a second exemplar for V., thus accounting for the many changes and corrections found in V. He now agrees with Brooke and characterizes V. as the first critical edition of the commentary on John, the work of a philologically well-trained scholar (pp. xxxvii, and xl–xlv). The only direct source for our text is, therefore, M., whose defects and excellences are minutely described (pp. xliv–lvii).

The first printed edition of the Greek text, by Huet, appeared in 1668. It is based on the late codex Parisinus 455,⁵ but contains numerous textual corrections and emendations. This edition was preceded by two editions of the Latin translation, of which only the first, that of Ambrogio Ferrari, 1551, is noteworthy. It is based on the text of V., showing, however, many still valuable corrections and changes. The first attempt at a critical edition was made by A. E. Brooke in 1891. Brooke also enjoyed the valuable help and advice of Wendland. The section (pp. lxi–lxxvi) on the catenæ to the gospel closes this first chapter of the Introduction.

Books 1–5 of the commentary were written in Alexandria during the twelve or fourteen years preceding Origen's departure from Alexandria to Cæsarea, in 232, in consequence of his severe controversies with Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria. The other twenty-seven books were composed, probably, during the five years following his settlement at Cæsarea. He dictated the work to his secretaries, to whom he also intrusted the exact copying of biblical references, indications of which we meet with in the text. The whole work, consisting of thirty two books, was deposited in the library at Cæsarea. A selection from nine books is all that is extant. Origen's work is the first complete commentary on the gospel of John, and its author is justly called the founder of scientific exegesis. Prior to it we find only commentaries on individual passages or sections, such as the *Hypotyposes* of Clement of Alexandria,⁵ and the notes of Heracleon (pp. cii–cvii).

Origen follows, on the whole, the exegetical method of the Alexandrian school. His philological interpretation is due to the influence of Philo. He does not even attempt to explain the discrepancies of the gospel narrative (X, 2 ff.); and thus gives up the historic accuracy and character of these reports, insisting merely on maintaining the underlying general idea. The

⁴ *The Fragments of Heracleon* [= "Texts and Studies," Vol. I, Part 4]. Cambridge, 1891; and *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1896.

⁵ On which see now also Giov. Mercati, *Un frammento delle Ipotiposi di Clemente Alessandrino.—Paralipomena Ambrosiana con alcuni appunti sulle benedizioni del cereo pasquale* [= "Studi e testi," 12]. (Roma, 1904; 148 pages.)

commentary is very diffuse and extremely verbose, the entire first book containing the exegesis of only the first five words of the gospel. Book VI begins with the commentary on chap. 1:19, and in the whole thirty-two books only thirteen chapters are commented upon. The tradition that the commentary consisted of thirty-nine books Preuschen declares worthless (p. lxxxi). The text of but eight books is preserved (1, 2, 6, 10, 13, 20, 28, 32); of Book 9 only a part; and fragments of the remainder. Like most of the later productions of Origen, the work was dedicated to Ambrosius, whom, in fun, he once calls ἐργοδώκτης;⁶ but Preuschen's conclusions, based thereon, go somewhat too far (p. lxxvii).

The text (pp. 3-480) is very carefully printed. It is impossible to enter into a detailed criticism of many readings preferred and emendations proposed by Preuschen, Wendland, and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. Those especially interested in this feature of the editor's work will find excellent supplementary material in such reviews as Erich Klostermann's.⁷ Pp. 481-574 contain fragments gathered from catenæ. The material printed is somewhat meager, but the editor explains this satisfactorily by the statement that he was not able to travel from library to library and collate materials himself. As in the preceding volumes containing Origen's writings, we find most copious indexes appended to the text (pp. 575-667).

It is a distinct pleasure to call the reader's attention to the successive brilliant discoveries of the indefatigable Dom Germanus Morin, who lately has specialized on the works of Jerome.⁸ Vol. III, Part III, of the *Anecdota Maredsolana*, under discussion, contains homilies on fourteen psalms, found in divers manuscripts, and now for the first time critically edited and explained. Nine of them, on Pss. 10, 15, 82, 84, 87, 89, 92, and 96, were found in the codex Vaticanus lat. 317 (of the year 1554); the codex Vaticanus Ottobon. lat. 478 (sixteenth century), of decidedly inferior

⁶ The Septuagint word for "taskmaster," Exod. 5:6.

⁷ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, April, 1904, pp. 265-82.

⁸ We mention here "Les monuments de la prédication de saint Jérôme," *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, Vol. I (1896), pp. 393-434; "Quatorze nouveaux discours inédits de saint Jérôme sur les Psaumes," *Revue Bénédictine*, Vol. XIX (1802), pp. 113-44; *Anecdota Maredsolana*, Vol. III, containing pars i, "Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri qui deperditi hactenus putabantur commentarioli in Psalmos," pars ii, "S. H. P. tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos; in Marci evangelium," etc.; pars iii, "S. H. P. tractatus in Psalmos quatuordecim novissime reperti. Accedunt eiusdem S. Hieronymi in Esaiam tractatus duo, et graeca in Psalmos fragmenta: item Arnobii iunioris *Expositiunculae in Evangelium*: una cum praefatione et indicibus ad vol. III, part. ii et iii. Maredsoli apud editorem; Oxoniae apud Parker; 1903. xxiv + 203 pages. 7s. 6d.

value; and the codex S. Marci Venet. lat., Class. I, xciv (twelfth century) which appears to be the best of the three, for it seems to be more directly based upon a still more ancient exemplar. The codex Laurent. Medic. Florentin. Plut. XVIII, xx (eleventh century) contains six of these nine homilies (82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 92) and, in addition, five more (on Pss. 83, 90, 91, 93, and 95). Style, diction, vocabulary, and the well-known exegetical method of Jerome are clearly to be seen in these homilies, especially when compared with many other passages from Jerome's authentic writings. From the point of view of oratory they present splendid specimens, if the defects naturally attaching to all improvised speeches are overlooked. Internal evidence of Jerome's authorship is found, in addition, at the close of the homily on Ps. 15, where he mentions his "book on the Hebrew Questions."⁹

In these homilies also Jerome shows himself an ardent controversialist who spareth not his texts in order to confound his enemies and smite his adversaries. Never does he neglect an opportunity to combat most ferociously the Origenists.¹⁰ The closing words of the homily on Ps. 87 indicate that most of these addresses were delivered immediately preceding communion services.¹¹ The text of the homilies (pp. 1-94) is followed by two homilies, by the same Father, on Isaiah 1:1-6, and 6:1-7 (pp. 97-122). The second discourse was pronounced by Jerome at the time of his most bitter fight against the Origenists (402 A. D.).¹² Some Greek fragments by Jerome on the Psalms are printed on pp. 122-28. That the Father is the author of all, or any, of these is very difficult to prove or disprove. See the editor's acute remarks in the Preface, pp. xix, xx.

The fragments of notes on the gospel by Arnobius (pp. 131-51) are good specimens of the ultra-spiritual exegesis for which the writer is known to history. Five indexes, to Vol. III, Parts II and III (pp. 155-203), close

⁹ "SABA enim verbum, ut in libro quoque Hebraicarum Quaestzionum diximus, quattuor res significat: plenitudinem et satietatem, iuramentum et septem" (p. 31).

¹⁰ See pp. 54, 56, 62, and Morin's notes.

¹¹ "Si voluerimus totum psalmum exponere, videmur nobismetipsis moram facere, quos iam hora compellit ad carnes Salvatoris veri agni et immaculata conscientia in unitate pacis accedere, ut possimus digne caelesti pane saturari, per Christum Jesum Dominum nostrum" (p. 50).

¹² See Preface, pp. xviii, xix. Date, as well as genuineness, is maintained, on the one hand, against Ambrosius M. Amelli (*S. Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri Tractatus contra Origenem de visione Esaiæ*, etc., 1901), dating it to the year 381, when, Jerome was still a youth; and, on the other hand, against Giov. Mercati (*Revue biblique*, July, 1901, pp. 385-92), who doubted the genuineness of Jerome's authorship of this treatise. See Morin, "Le Nouveau Traité de S. Jérôme sur la Vision d'Isaïe édité par Dom A. Amelli," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, October, 1907, pp. 810 ff., and "Pour l'authenticité du Traité sur la Vision d'Isaïe," *ibid.*, January, 1902, pp. 30 ff.

this volume of the *Anecdota Maredsolana*. May it be our pleasure to welcome many more volumes of these studies by the erudite Benedictine author.

Adolf Büchler's name is well known to students of Jewish history immediately preceding and following the time of Jesus Christ. He has chosen a subject¹³ on which much has been published by Jewish and Christian scholars.¹⁴ The author, in contrast to many of his predecessors makes use principally of the tannaitic tradition in talmudic and midrashic literature, which he considers as wholly reliable so long as convincing proof to the contrary is not adduced. He deplores and deprecates the unscientific and prejudiced attitude to the Talmud of such scholars as Kuenen, Wellhausen, Schürer, and others, who reject talmudic reports whenever those of Josephus and of the gospels differ from them.

In the first of the four chapters the author discusses the **לְשָׁכֶת הַגְּזִירָה**, the hall *Gazzith*, or hewn-stone chamber, the place where the Great Sanhedrin, called *beth-din*, assembled. It was located on the west side of the inner court of the temple and had two exits—one leading from the court of the priests, for purposes of sacrifice, and another from the water-gate, for the people. Josephus, assuming that the *βουλή* was located in the city or on the west side of the temple mount, is proof of the fact that the *βουλή* and the *beth-din*, in the hall *Gazzith*, are distinct and different councils. Later on the Great Sanhedrin or *beth-din* was transferred from the hall *Gazzith* to the east hall of the temple, and, still later, had its meeting-place in the city proper.

Chap. 2 is concerned with the nature and constituency of the council or tribunal, meeting in the hall *Gazzith*. This body is by no means identical with the Sanhedrin mentioned by Josephus and in the gospels, although both have the same name, existed at the same time, and represented themselves as the supreme Jewish authority of city and land. As a matter of fact, the one is a religious tribunal, regulating the work of temple and priests, of religious life, sacrifices, etc.;¹⁵ the other, a civic authority, having charge also—in a limited manner—of criminal affairs and judicial matters in general, and regulating civic observances peculiar to the Jewish nation.

¹³ *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth-Din in der Quaderkammer des Jerusalemischen Tempels*. Wien: Hölder, 1902. viii + 252 pages. M. 6.

¹⁴ See Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, Vol. II, pp. 188 ff.

¹⁵ "Die Verfügungen des *beth-din* befassten sich zum grossen Teile mit dem Opferdienste und mit allem was mit den Personen und Gegenständen desselben zusammenhängt: dann mit der Erfüllung der an den Bodenertrag sich knüpfenden Satzungen, der über die Feldecke, den zweiten Zehnt, das Brachjahr, die gemischten Arten; schliesslich auch mit der Überwachung der Beobachtung des Religionsgesetzes überhaupt" (p. 98).

(see *Sanhedr.*, xi, 2-4). The reports that this latter tribunal at times met in one of the halls of the temple, probably the par-hedrin hall, does not militate against the view expressed. The civic Sanhedrin in Jerusalem—that body to which Josephus and the gospels refer—consisted of high-ranking priests and the old aristocracy of the city. Their reserved, aristocratic character was always preserved, only a small portion of it being ever pharisaic-democratic. The priests originally controlling the *beth-din*, in the hall *Gazzith*, were for a time supplanted by the Pharisees, whose influence can be seen on many occasions. It is true that even during the decade or two preceding the destruction of the temple the Sadducean teachings were predominant, though on public occasions due regard was taken of the pharisaic interpretation of the Law. The *beth-din* replaced the individual priest. This fact proves that it was originally composed of the chief priests; and when the Pharisees gained control in the *beth-din*, we find, at the same time, the בְּנֵי נָשִׁים existing as a corporate body, maintaining their authority independent of the *beth-din*. It is very probable that, instead of the reputed number of seventy-one, the *beth-din* numbered in reality only twenty-three members. In addition to it there were meeting, at times, on the temple mount two other bodies, each numbering twenty-three members.¹⁶ The number seventy-one referred to the joint-meeting of the three bodies.

Chap. 3 discusses the president of the great *beth-din*, the Great Council in Jerusalem. In four sections the author speaks of Gamaliel I., *ha-zakēn*, and his son Simon; of Hillel and the title of ruler (נָשִׁי=nāsi); and of Shemaiah and Abtalion¹⁷ and their predecessors. These men were legal-religious authorities, leaders and presidents of that highest body—the successor of the biblical עֲדָה—governing and directing the religious affairs of Jerusalem and the nation, identical, not with the Sanhedrin of Josephus, but with the Sanhedrin of the *Midrash Rabba*. They are called בֵּית דִין הַגָּדוֹל שְׁבִירּוֹתָלָם and אָב בֵּית דִין נְשִׁירָא and *ab-beth-din*, the former title, adopted probably by the Pharisees; the latter indicating a pre-eminent position in that body—next to the *nāsi*, perhaps the leader of the college under the supervision of the *beth-din*.¹⁸ This perhaps explains the statement of Paul in Acts

¹⁶ See pp. 109, 110, 128, 129, n. 111.

¹⁷ Also called Pollion or Ptollion; a leader of the Pharisees in the middle of the first century B. C., and by tradition vice-president of the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem; teacher and predecessor of Hillel.

¹⁸ Jelski, *Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Sanhedrions*, pp. 22-28, however, states that the *nāsi* was the high-priest, while *ab-beth-din* was a pharisaic *tanna* (see Emil G. Hirsch, article "High priest," in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VI, p. 593, col. 2, below).

22:3, that he had sat at the feet of Gamaliel. Hillel, Gamaliel, and Simon were never presidents of the Great Sanhedrin of Josephus, but only of the *beth-din* in Jerusalem, the highest court in religious matters. In their capacity as religious leaders of the nation they were, at the same time, members of the Sanhedrin, in which they exercised great influence owing to their learning and force of character, but never held any office.

Chap. 4 takes up the position of the high-priest in temple and nation. Büchler denies that the high-priest was ever the political representative of the nation in the administration of the province of Judea. He was merely the ecclesiastical leader in the Jewish temple at Jerusalem. It is true that he belonged to the political body of the *ἀρχερεῖς*, but he was simply one of them, and only, as presiding officer, at times *primus inter pares*.¹⁹ It is usually assumed that this body is identical with the Sanhedrin, the supreme court of justice, because in the gospels the same groups are mentioned as parts of the Sanhedrin which in Josephus hold the political leadership in Jerusalem. Reports, however, are too scanty and fragmentary to yield an accurate knowledge of the position and character, the work and influence, of the Sanhedrin, mentioned by Josephus and in the gospels. The Roman procurator, but never the Jewish king, granted the Sanhedrin and its presiding officer, the high-priest, some sort of power or influence.²⁰ Only so long as the *beth-din* in the hall *Gazzith* was composed of high dignitaries of the temple, i. e., Sadducean in character, did the high-priest have influence with and power over this ecclesiastical body. As soon as the *beth-din* became pharisaic in its composition, the high-priest and his followers had to submit to their decisions, and the sacrifices and the worship of the temple were performed in accordance with the pharisaic interpretation of the Law.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BELMONT, MASS.

¹⁹ Hirsch, *loc. cit.*, says: "The high priest was the presiding officer in the Sanhedrin. This view conflicts with the later Jewish tradition, according to which the Pharisaic *tannaim* (the *Zuggim*) at the head of the academies presided over the great Sanhedrin also. However, a careful reading of the sources, as well as the fact that in the post-Maccabean period the high priest was looked upon as exercising in all things political, legal, and sacerdotal supreme authority, shows it to be almost certain that the presidency of the Sanhedrin was vested in the high priests."

²⁰ "The high-priesthood had changed greatly in character, in so far as it ceased to be a hereditary and a life office. High priests were appointed and removed with great frequency. This may account for the otherwise strange use of the title in the plural (*ἀρχερεῖς*) in the New Testament and in Josephus. The deposed priests seem to have retained the title and to have continued to exercise certain functions."—Hirsch, *loc. cit.*